



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/489,286	01/21/2000	David A. Cathey	2269-7129.2US	5649
63162 7590 01/15/2009 TRASK BRITT, P.C./ MICRON TECHNOLOGY P.O. BOX 2550 SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84110				
EXAMINER				
PATEL, ASHOK				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2889				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
01/15/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

USPTOMail@traskbritt.com

**Application No.****Applicant(s)**

09/489,286

CATHEY ET AL.

**Response to Rule 312 Communication****Examiner****Art Unit**

Ashok Patel

2889

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 06 January 2009 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☒ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☐ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

**Note:**

Applicant's supplemental communication dated 01/06/2009, is acknowledged. The Examiner verified that inventors of the record are all of: David A. Cathey, Surjit S. Chadha and Behnam Moradi.

As to applicant's issue relating to allowance of claims 33-39, it is the position of the Examiner that the claims 33-39 is in view of withdrawal of the prior art rejection of claims 33-39 (in addition to withdrawal of obviousness-type double patenting rejection). Withdrawal of prior art rejection is due to the fact that prior art of the record does not teach or suggest applicant's "claimed" invention as a whole, either taken alone or in combination with other prior art reference of the record. Dependent claims are allowed due to their dependencies upon corresponding allowed independent claim.

/Ashok Patel/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2889